have resulted in Bucheit's default on a $1.1 million loan from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) loan. Furthermore, Bucheit International has experienced numerous unethical and questionable activities in its dealings with Cairo Amman Bank of Gaza. For example, Bucheit has discovered that corporate accounts were opened without proper corporate documentation; corporate checks denominated in dollars were endorsed and cashed by individuals, without first being deposited into the corporate account; canceled checks were not returned; corporate funds in excess of $100,000 were used to guarantee an overdraft facility of a private individual, without knowledge or approval by the corporation; and a letter of guarantee was written by a bank without notifying Bucheit, in violation of Bucheit management's strict instructions. In addition, Bucheit's plant and equipment were stolen and continue to be operated illegally. Moreover, the Palestinian Authority (PA) has pocketed Bucheit's value-added-tax (VAT) reimbursement from Israel as well as kept the income tax deducted from Bucheit's payments. Without access to its funds or equipment, Bucheit is currently in default of the $1.1 million OPIC loan.

Recently, Bucheit filed a civil RICO (Racketeering, Influence and Corrupt Organizations) complaint against the Cairo Amman Bank in Gaza for misappropriating loan proceeds advanced to Bucheit from OPIC. On August 17, 1999, U.S. District Judge Kathleen McDonald O'Malley found that the Cairo Amman Bank engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity that caused the failure of Bucheit's precast concrete plant in Gaza. Specifically, the court ruled that there existed an ''enterprise'' made up of the Bank, Bank employees, an influential Bank customer and other persons, and the Bank knowingly participated, directly and indirectly, in the conduct of the affairs of the ''enterprise'' through a pattern of wire fraud. Judge O'Malley awarded Bucheit roughly $15 million in damages. Included in that amount is the $1.4 million due OPIC.

I find it troubling that the House-Senate conferees on the Foreign Operations Appropriations for Fiscal Year (FY) 2000 are considering the addition of $400 million for the Palestinian Authority, while an American investor and the United States government have been blatantly ripped off. To date, the Palestinian Authority has neither authorized an official, internal investigation into the existing ''enterprise,'' nor has it meted out proper punishment to the individuals involved.

As a result, I have requested that the House-Senate Conferees on the Foreign Operations Appropriations for FY 2000 withhold the $15,206,403 owed Bucheit International, which includes a $1,436,837 loan repayment for OPIC, from the $400 million appropriation for the Palestinian Authority.

Unpunished, the guilty parties will continue with their illegal and unethical behavior to the injury of future American investors, the U.S. government and the Palestinian people. To create jobs, growth and higher income, a nation must convince its own citizens as well as foreigners that they can safely invest: fair tax laws and fair enforcement, independent courts enforcing the law consistently and upholding contract rights, strong banks that safeguard savings, and vigilance against hidden ties between government and business interests that are inappropriate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1059, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I want to elaborate on the remarks I made on September 15, 1999, regarding certain provisions of S. 1059, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

As I noted during floor debate, I strongly support the vast majority of this bill, particularly the pay and retirement provisions. But this good bill is marred by some of the text that sets up a National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) as a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy (DOE). I have reservations about the way these provisions were inserted in the bill—with little discussion among the Members of the Conference Committee—and I have reservations about the substance of some of these provisions.

I will not speak on the conference process at length, but I cannot dismiss it because I cannot remember the Congress acting on such an important matter with so little information and so little discussion among the Members of the conference committee. Neither the House nor the Senate Defense Authorization bill contained language requiring a comprehensive restructuring of the Department of Energy, yet we ended up with about 50 pages worth of text. We did have former Senator Warren Rudman testify before the committee prior to conference, but we did not take testimony from the Energy Department itself, or from the senior statesmen of the labs and nuclear weapons complex, men like Johnny Foster or Harold Agnew. The legislation that the conference committee ultimately produced was not vetted in any meaningful manner among the Members, the Administration, or outside experts. This is not a good process for an important piece of national security legislation.

My first and foremost concern on the substance of the legislation is that we have blurred the lines of accountability when it comes to preventing and ferreting out future espionage at our nuclear labs and weapons complex. I think one thing we can all agree on is that counter-intelligence requires a clear line of command and accountability. A clear chain of command was at the heart of Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 61, which the Cox Committee unanimously recommended be implemented. This legislation contradicts PDD 61 by setting up two different counterintelligence offices with overlapping responsibilities, and no clear direction on how the offices are supposed to interface with each other. As a member of the Cox Committee, I find it disturbing and ironic that the restructuring provisions fail in what should have been its top priority: setting up clear lines of command and accountability on counterintelligence.

My second and more general concern is that the Secretary's ability to conduct oversight of the complex could be seriously hampered by this legislation. We already know that the price of no oversight is a legacy of contaminated sites that will cost hundreds of billions to clean up. Revelations about contamination of workers at Paducah show that we cannot disregard the health and safety concerns for workers in the nuclear weapons complex and the communities that surround these sites. The history of the last few decades tells us that the nuclear weapon sites and activities of the Department of Energy require more sunshine, more scrutiny, and more oversight, not less. Any Secretary of Energy must have strong oversight authority, and I fear that this legislation detracts from rather than adding to the Secretary's oversight powers.

Having criticized these provisions, let me say that I do not think they were drafted with bad intent. But they were drafted hastily, without adequate hearings, with no vetting among outside authorities, without the benefit of constructive criticism that comes in the mark-up process, and without any discussion among members of the conference committee.

A good example of the type of confusion that arises from these hastily-drafted provisions is the work of the Energy Department's non-weapons facilities—the science labs. The science labs perform a great deal of work for almost every element designated as part of the new National Nuclear Security Administration. This is especially true for the current Offices of Non-Proliferation and National Security (NN), Fissile Materials Disposition, Naval Reactors, and the Office of Intelligence. The language of the conference report, though, raises the question of whether the current cooperation between the science labs and weapons facilities will be allowed to continue, or be prohibited by the language separating the weapons labs from the rest of the DOE complex.

For the Office of Non-Proliferation and National Security for example, the science labs provide a significant portion of the technologies and expertise for such programs as Materials, Protection, Control and Accountability (MPC&A), a program I helped establish. This is also true for the Nuclear Cities Initiative, in which a science lab (Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, or PNNL) co-chairs the U.S. effort in one of the first three Russian nuclear cities selected. That arrangement is especially fruitful because PNNL is the only U.S. lab with real-life experience making the transition from a closed U.S. ''nuclear city,'' Hanford, which produced key nuclear materials for the WWII-era nuclear weapons, to a non-weapons community in which such scientific expertise is put to more peaceful use.

The science labs play a major role in providing technical expertise and collaboration for the Initiatives to Prevent Proliferation (IPP) program, attempting to develop self-sustaining, U.S. and Russian scientific collaborations that are mutually beneficial. The science labs provide valuable technologies and expertise of the NN efforts in Safeguards and Transparency regarding Russian nuclear warheads. Science lab personnel, in fact, chair important working groups in that effort, and have developed technologies that will be used in identifying and securing Russian warhead materials.

The science labs are vital parts of all of DOE's efforts to build lab-to-lab relationships and programs that enhance U.S. national security by applying American eyes and know-how to the potentially dangerous situations in the weapons of mass destruction (WMD) complex of the former Soviet Union. The science labs also play a critical role in the NM arms control programs, providing vital technologies

for verifying compliance with arms control agreements (reductions, dismantlement, production, testing, safeguard and storage, etc.) and detecting the attempted proliferation of WMD materials. Such technologies are proving useful in terms of all WMD materials—chemical, biological and radiological.

Science labs also make major contributions to the efforts of the Office of Fissile Materials Disposition (MD). A science lab leads the U.S. effort in the International Nuclear Safety Program. Of course, the science labs will continue to contribute a great deal to the DOE offices outside the NNSA, on matters, for example, of energy, the environment and nuclear cleanup. Also, like the weapons labs, have the authority and expertise to ''work for others,'' and often perform important work for other agencies such as the Department of Defense, Justice, State, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The science labs' contribution to the offices that are scheduled to be in the NNSA is clear, and I do not believe the conferees had any intention of scuttling these contributions by implying that the science labs could not work for NNSA offices. However, the language contained in the conference report is not clear on this question. Title XXXII concentrates solely on the three nuclear weapons laboratories and production facilities, and while it makes specific provision for those weapons labs to perform work for other agencies and for DOE offices outside the new, semi-autonomous administration, it is silent on the role of the non-weapons labs. Such ambiguity breeds confusion and illustrates the flaws in the process of drafting the DOE reorganization title and inserting it into the conference agreement. I served on the conference committee and I was involved in negotiating some of the conference report. I do not think that it was the intention of the conferees for this legislation to impede the continuation of these services in any way.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF RADIOLOGY ON ITS FIRST 75 YEARS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, among the greatest advances of medicine in this century has been the development and professionalization of radiology. Therefore, I rise today to congratulate the American College of Radiology and its 31,000 members on its 75th anniversary.

While the numbers of diagnostic radiologists, radiation oncologists and medical physicists comprising the college have changed dramatically, the ACR's main objective has not. Through the years, working with Members of Congress, key Federal, State, and local agencies and a wide variety of health care and consumer organizations, the college has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of patient care.

The American College of Radiology has met this objective through numerous programs. Beginning with mammography, ACR has initiated several national accreditation programs designed to assure high quality performance from both health care professionals and imaging equipment. In addition to mammography, accreditation programs are in place for ultrasound, radiation oncology, stereotactic needle breast biopsy, magnetic resonance imaging, ultrasound-guided breast biopsy.

ACR's groundbreaking mammography accreditation program, which began as a voluntary effort in 1987, now has become a nationally mandated program. In part, as a result of this program and other breast cancer early detection promotion efforts, the National Cancer Institute has recorded, for the past few years, the first declines in mortality from breast cancer.

In addition to accreditation, the ACR has improved the quality of care through its Performance Standards™, Appropriateness Criteria™, life-saving research through clinical trials and medical continuing education programs for members.

The performance standards are principles for delivering high quality radiological care. They are revised and expanded every year. The standards cover a wide variety of procedures. The Appropriateness Criteria™ ensure that the most appropriate examination is done in the most appropriate setting at the most appropriate time. More than 500 medical experts have assisted in developing these criteria.

The college also offers numerous continuing education seminars each year.

ACR manages the federally funded Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG). This organization carries out multidisciplinary cancer trials nationwide. RTOG has gathered numerous medical facilities in providing state-of-the-art treatment for a wide variety of cancers.

As a complement to RTOG, the college also operates the Radiological Diagnostic Oncology Group (RDOG). This program evaluates current and emerging imaging technologies used in the management of patients with malignant disease. NCI funds RDOG so that the group may provide a timely approach for the cost-effective use of new technologies.

Even before the ACR initiated its quality improvement and research programs, radiologists were deeply involved in working to improve patient care. World War I, for example, presented a great need and a great opportunity for radiology. One of the founders of the college, Dr. Edwin Ernst, recalls how using a table built by German prisoners, and a rolling floor fluoroscopic gas tube, he pinpointed the location of bullet fragments. And radiologists in general played a major role in treating and diagnosing patients in those rugged field hospitals.

Later, in the 1920's the International Radiological Congress helped to standardize measurement. The ACR also worked to secure financing of the x-ray equipment at the Bureau of Standards.

It was also in the 1920's that the American College of Radiology was born as two dozen radiologists gathered for the first time officially to transact the business of the college: to plan ways to improve their profession's expertise.

When the United States entered World War II, radiologists mobilized to serve their country. The college volunteered to handle radiology manpower issues for the Army. The growth and development of radiology after World War paralled post-war growth of the Nation.

In the early 1950's, three dedicated members of the college—Drs. Eddie Ernst, Wally Wasson and Ben Orndoff—began to cajole, badger and convince their fellow radiologists into preserving the history of their profession. In 1955 they gathered for the first time as the Gas Tube Gang. The gas tube was the symbol of the early imaging technology.

Through their efforts the college's archive's was created and today it is filled with gas tubes, other early radiological devices, mementos from Dr. Roentgen, Madame Curie and other pioneers, and pages and pages of rich history of the ACR and the field of radiology.

So it is with all of this history in mind and the great contributions the ACR has made to the practice of medicine that I wish the American College of Radiology well on its 75th and continued success in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 16, Hurricane Floyd slammed into North Carolina, bringing heavy winds and torrential rains to my state, including my Second Congressional District. I have been helping my constituents who are struggling to overcome this devastating disaster, and as a result, I was absent from the Chamber for rollcall vote No. 425 and rollcall vote No. 426. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on No. 425 and ''no'' on No. 426.

IN RECOGNITION OF AGUSTÍN RIVERA

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1999

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of an extraordinary member of my community. For the past decade, Agustín Rivera has demonstrated time and again his commitment and his vision for his community.

Mr. Rivera was a founding member of Música Against Drugs, a Puerto Rican and Latino, client-driven, community-based agency created to serve the needs of individual and families affected by the HIV/AIDS and drug addition epidemics in the Brooklyn, New York communities of Williamsburg, Greenpoint and Bushwick. Mr. Rivera's skills, talent, and energy helped the late Manny Maldonado, the founder of Música, establish a program to fulfill a desperately acute need. For several years they, like too many who were on the vanguard battling the pandemic of AIDS, worked very hard with very little money.

After three years of volunteer organizing, Música received its first public grant. This gave Mr. Rivera the opportunity to become stipend/outreach worker and, later, Outreach Coordinator. He then became the first program director of an innovative nutritional program, La Cocina del Pueblo, which provides nutritional services to people with HIV/AIDS. Subsequently, he became the Volunteer and Outreach Coordinator and, most recently, the Director of the Community Prevention Project.

Even while giving his all—and then some—to Música, Mr. Rivera found the time for some